

- *New customers* was the least preferred option – chosen by 16% of residence customers and 12% of business customers.

2. *Generally speaking, the ranking of options was consistent across virtually all types of customers – including residence and business customers, as well as customers who currently have cellular phones or pagers.*

- However, while the general *rank order* of the options (geographic split first, followed by specific services, followed by new customers) was consistent across customer subgroups, there were some differences in the actual proportions choosing each option. For example:
 - Large business customers are particularly strong proponents of geographic split (preferred by 69% of customers in this group).
 - Among residence customers, more educated customers, customers with higher incomes, and whites are generally more likely than average to prefer geographic split. On the other hand, customers with less education, customers with lower incomes, African Americans, and Hispanics are *less* likely than average to prefer geographic split. Keep in mind, however, that even among those subgroups who are “less likely than average” to choose geographic split, the proportion preferring geographic split is still higher than the proportion choosing either of the other options. (African Americans, who show no strong preference among the three options, are the one exception to this rule.)

3. *In addition to being the most preferred option, geographic split is also perceived as the option for everyone in the state.*

- A total of 54% of residence customers and 60% of business customers believe that *geographic split* would be the fairest option.
- 24% of residence customers and 24% of business customers choose *specific services* as fairest.
- 17% of residence customers and 12% of business customers choose *new customers* as fairest.

4. *The survey results suggest that the underlying benefit of geographic split is that it would offer an area code solution that is clear, logical, and easy to understand. Customers are less likely to feel this way about specific services or new customers; what's more, each of these other options is saddled with a significant drawback, according to customers.*

- For example, in explaining why they would prefer *geographic split*, 42% of residence customers and 41% of business customers stated that this option would be easier to understand, more logical, or less confusing than the other options. Smaller proportions feel the same way about *specific services* (among those who preferred this option, 29% of residence and 30% of business customers offered these reasons) or *new customers* (26% of residence and 22% of business customers).
- All customers were also asked to react to a series of potential benefits and drawbacks for each area code option. And the results suggest that customers in general feel that the benefits of *geographic split* outweigh any of its drawbacks. On the other hand, when it comes to *specific services* and *new customers*, customers indicate that certain drawbacks outweigh the potential benefits of these options.
 - The strongest benefit of *geographic split*, according to customers, is that *all customers in a given region would have the same area code* (mentioned as a major benefit by 69% of residence customers and 71% of business customers). The strongest drawback is that *businesses would need to update advertising and business cards* (mentioned as a major drawback by a smaller 44% of residence and 51% of business customers).
 - The strongest benefit of *specific services* is that *all customers with standard telephone service would keep the 203 area code* (mentioned as a major benefit by 52% of residence and 55% of business customers). However, customers are more likely to feel strongly about a drawback of this option — the fact that it would *offer a temporary solution to the number shortage problem* (mentioned as a major drawback by 56% of residence and 60% of business customers).
 - The strongest benefit of *new customers* is that *all current customers would keep the 203 area code* (mentioned as a major drawback by 55% of residence and 56% of business customers). However, two drawbacks of this option outweigh this benefit — the fact that *there could be different area codes within the same business or household* (a major drawback to 69% of residence and 74% of business customers), and the fact that *neighbors could have different area codes* (a major drawback to 62% of residence and 64% of business customers).

5. After customers were taken through the list of potential benefits and drawbacks for each option, they were once again asked to tell us which option they prefer. Although there were no dramatic differences in preference from one point in time to the next, customers were somewhat more likely to choose geographic split after the benefits/drawbacks discussion than they were initially.

- The proportion of customers choosing *geographic split* as the option they'd prefer to see adopted right now went from:
 - 54% among residence customers before the discussion of benefits and drawbacks, to 57% after the discussion.
 - 54% among business customers before the discussion, to 60%.
- By contrast, while the proportion choosing *new customers* remained fairly constant across the two measures, the proportion choosing *specific services* declined somewhat, from:
 - 27% among residence customers before the discussion of benefits and drawbacks, to 22% after the discussion.
 - 31% among business customers before the discussion, to 26%.

6. *When customers are asked to name what they consider to be the most effective methods of communicating the area code change to customers, they're most likely to mention bill inserts. A separate mailing from SNET, television ads, and newspaper ads form a second "tier" of preferences when it comes to communications methods.*

- 60% of both residence and business customers feel that bill inserts would be an effective method of communicating the change;
- 45% of residence and 51% of business customers mentioned a separate mailing from SNET;
- 45% of residence and 44% of business customers mentioned television ads;
- 41% of residence and 42% of business customers mentioned newspaper ads.

Conclusions

The findings from this research demonstrate that when customers are given a choice among three possible methods of introducing a new area code in Connecticut, the *geographic split* approach is the clear preference among residence and business customers alike. In fact, even customers with cellular phones or pagers — customers who would in many cases need to have their equipment reprogrammed — are no less likely to favor the geographic split option.

The survey results suggest that the geographic split option is preferred by customers because, according to them, it would offer the *clearest, easiest to grasp, and most logical* solution to the number shortage problem. On the other hand, the *new customers* option

seemed to be the *least* clear and logical approach; in particular, customers were very concerned about the fact that a household or business could have different area codes within the same location. Moreover, while the *specific services* approach might offer a solution that is relatively clear and easy to understand, customers do not like the fact that this option would only temporarily address the number shortage problem.

In the end, when customers were asked to re-assess their preferences on the basis of the survey's discussion of benefits and drawbacks, their choice of geographic split was, if anything, even stronger than it was initially. All in all, the survey findings demonstrate that whether the question is asked on a top of mind basis, or after a detailed discussion of the pros and cons of each option, *geographic split* remains the clearest preference among residence and business customers throughout the state.

1

Initial Reactions and Preferences

Introduction

As we suggested in the Introduction to this report, this research was designed to understand customers' preferences regarding the introduction of a new area code at two "points in time" – first, after hearing a simple, brief description of each method, and second, after having been exposed to potential strengths and weaknesses of each method. In this chapter, we'll examine the "*pre-strengths and weaknesses*" component of this measurement, and we'll see that across all customer types, the *geographic split* option was the most preferred option, by a significant degree.

Prior Awareness

Before survey respondents were asked to react to the area code options themselves, they were first asked if they had heard, before our interview, about "the possibility of a new area code for Connecticut." As the following table indicates, a slight majority of both residence and business customers had heard about this possibility, with business customers a bit more likely to be aware than residence customers.

	Residence Customers	Business Customers
New Area Code Possibility	%	%
Heard	54	60
Have not heard/not sure	46	40

Within the residence population, cellular and pager customers are somewhat more likely than customers as a whole to say they've heard about the new area code issue. In fact, residence customers who have *both* a cellular phone and a pager in the household are *significantly* more likely than average to be aware of the issue.

	Total Residence	Cellular/Pager Status		Cellular/Pager Mix			
		All Cellular Customers	All Paging Customers	Cellular Only	Pager Only	Both	Neither
New Area Code Possibility	%	%	%	%	%		
Heard	54	62	62	58	53	71	53
Have not heard/not sure	46	38	38	42	47	29	47

Business awareness was less likely to vary by key characteristics. In fact, levels of awareness were statistically indistinguishable between smaller businesses and large businesses.

	Total Business	Smaller Businesses	Large Businesses
New Area Code Possibility	%	%	%
Heard	60	60	58
Have not heard/not sure	40	40	42

Initial Reactions to Each Option

Survey respondents were next presented with a brief description of each area code option (in order to minimize potential question-order effects, the order in which the options were presented was randomized across the sample). After each description was read, survey respondents were asked whether they considered that option to be "fair or unfair."

The results to this initial *fairness vs. unfairness* question exhibits a pattern of response that, as we'll see, is consistent throughout the survey findings:

- First, respondents were most likely to consider *geographic split* to be a fair option – that is, they were more likely to call this option *fair* than to call the other two options fair. And as we'll see throughout this report, customers across the board – residence and business, wireless and non-wireless – consistently chose geographic split as their most preferred option.
- Second, respondents were most likely to consider *new customers* (which is how we referred to the "distributed overlay" option in the survey) to be *unfair*. And we'll see that this option was, for the most part, the *least preferred* of the three options, among all types of customers.

The following table shows the results for residence and business customers generally:

	Residence Customers	Business Customers
	%	%
Geographic Split:		
Fair	74	81
Unfair	20	14
Depends (vol)	4	3
Not sure	3	2
New Customers:		
Fair	49	43
Unfair	42	52
Depends (vol)	4	2
Not sure	5	2
Specific Services:		
Fair	68	68
Unfair	26	25
Depends (vol)	1	4
Not sure	5	3

The fairness/unfairness results show few major differences by type of customer, especially within the residence sample. In fact, interestingly enough, cellular customers and paging customers are no less likely to consider the *specific services* option to be fair - an option that would essentially single them out for a new area code.

	Total Residence	Cellular/Paging Status		Cellular/Paging Mix			
		All Cellular Customers	All Paging Customers	Cellular Only	Pager Only	Both	Neither
	%	%	%	%	%		
Geographic Split:							
Fair	74	78	77	78	76	79	72
Unfair	29	15	15	16	17	14	21
Depends (vol)	4	4	4	4	3	5	3
Not sure	3	2	3	2	4	3	3
New Customers:							
Fair	49	46	45	47	46	44	50
Unfair	42	49	48	49	46	50	40
Depends (vol)	4	2	3	1	2	4	4
Not sure	5	3	4	3	5	3	6
Specific Services:							
Fair	68	71	70	72	71	70	68
Unfair	26	25	23	26	24	22	26
Depends (vol)	1	2	2	1	1	4	1
Not sure	5	3	4	2	5	4	5

How is it possible that a majority of cellular and paging customers consider the *specific services* option to be fair? Although we did not *directly* ask this question as part of the survey (that is, we did not ask something like, "Even though you are a cellular customers, you consider the *specific services* option fair – why is that?"), we can gather some insight into this issue by examining responses to a question asked later in the interview. In this question, customers who chose *specific services* as their *most preferred* option were asked to explain why this was their first choice.

The results to this question suggest that a number of cellular and paging customers are in *favor* of the idea of a separate area code for these services, because such

an option would distinguish these services in a *positive* way. For example, cellular and pager customers are actually more likely than other customers (i.e., customers who have *neither* service) to say that *specific services*:

- Would make it easier for people to know when they're calling a cellular phone or pager (28% of cellular and 15% of paging customers who preferred *specific services* cited this as their reason; the comparable proportion among non-subscribers who chose this option is just 6%);
- Would be "easy," "logical," or "less confusing" (mentioned by 32% of cellular and 37% of paging customers who preferred *specific services*, vs. 27% of non-subscribers);
- Would make it "easier to keep track of numbers" (14% of cellular and 16% of paging customers, vs. 3% of non-subscribers).

Thus, it appears that for many customers who consider the *specific services* option to be fair — and in particular, for many of the cellular and paging customers who feel this way — the operative word is "easier." These customers feel that such an option would make it easier to determine when one is calling a cellular phone or pager.

Customer Preferences

On the basis of the initial descriptions of the three options, customers were asked to state which of the three options they would "prefer to see adopted right now." Consistent with the findings on the *fairness* of each option, customers across the board are most likely, by a significant degree, to choose *geographic split* as the option they'd like to see adopted right now. *Specific services* ranks a distant second; *new customers* ranks a distant third.

The following table shows the overall results for residence and business customers generally:

	Residence Customers	Business Customers
	%	%
<i>Prefer Adopted Right Now:</i>		
Geographic split	54	54
Specific services	27	31
New customers	16	12
Not sure	3	3

Among residence customers, the *geographic split* option is preferred, by substantial margins, among wireless and non-wireless customers alike:

	Total Residence	Cellular/Paging Status		Cellular/Paging Mix			
		All Cellular Customers	All Paging Customers	Cellular Only	Pager Only	Both	Neither
	%	%	%	%	%		
<i>Prefer Adopted Now:</i>							
Geographic split	54	56	54	56	52	56	54
Specific services	27	26	28	26	33	24	27
New customers	16	16	14	18	13	14	16
Not sure	3	2	4	-	1	6	4

While business customers in general prefer geographic split, preferences for this option are especially strong among large business customers. (As we'll see in the following chapters of this report, large businesses react strongly *against* the new customers option in particular — and against the idea that with this option, business customers who add lines would end up with two area codes within the same location.)

	Total Business	Smaller Businesses	Large Businesses
<i>Prefer Adopted Right Now</i>	%	%	%
Geographic split	54	53	69
Specific services	31	32	24
New customers	12	12	6
Not sure	3	3	-

We also examined preferences among various *subgroups* of both residence and business customers. And while geographic split is preferred virtually across the board, there are some interesting differences in response to this question by type of customer.

For example:

Residence Customers:

- As one might expect, residence customers who say they have plans to add a new telephone line in the next six months are less likely than average to prefer *new customers* option (10%, vs. 16% among all residence customers). Instead, while a majority of these customers prefer geographic split (56%), a higher than average proportion prefer specific services (34%, vs. 27%).
- Among residence customers, the survey suggests that older customers are somewhat less likely than average to favor geographic split (although geographic split nevertheless gets higher proportions than the other options). For example, compared to a residence-wide average of 54% choosing geographic split, the proportion is 47% among customers aged 50-64 and 47% among customers aged 65 or older.
- Residence customers who are single (48%) or divorced/separated/widowed (49%) are also slightly less likely to prefer geographic split.
- The survey results suggest that preference for geographic split increases with level of education — from 48% of those with a high school education or less, to 55% of those with some college education, to 63% of those with a college degree. In turn, customers with a high school education or less are a bit more likely than average to prefer *new customers* (21%).
- Geographic split is also more likely to be preferred among whites (57%) than among African Americans (35%) or Hispanics (40%). In fact, African

Americans are one of the few residence subgroups who seem truly split on the area code issue generally – 35% prefer geographic split, 37% prefer specific services, and 27% prefer new customers.

- Preferences for geographic split increase as level of income increases – from 46% among those with an income of \$35,000 or less, to 51% among those with an income between \$35,000 and \$50,000, to 69% among those with an income over \$50,000.
- Geographic split is somewhat more likely than average to be preferred by customers with children in the household (59%).

Business Customers:

- Business customers who are planning to add new lines are also unlikely to choose *new customers* (4%, vs. 12% among all business customers). However, business customers in this group are also less likely than average to prefer specific services (13%, vs. 31%), and are much more likely to prefer *geographic split* (83%, vs. 54%). (The heavy preference for geographic split is in part explained by the fact that the subgroup of business customers who are planning to add lines is disproportionately made up of *large* businesses. And as we've just seen, large businesses are more likely than average to favor geographic split in the first place.)
- Business customers who have been in operation fewer than 2 years are less likely than average to prefer *new customers* (5%).
- Interestingly, preferences for the various options do not tend to vary significantly by the type of equipment the customers has – equipment that might have to be reprogrammed under certain options. For example, business customers with fax machines, cellular phones, pagers, and autodialers follow the same pattern that other customers follow – geographic split is most preferred, followed by specific services, followed by new customers.

Customers were also asked for their *second choice* out of the three; the findings are consistent between residence and business customers:

Residence Results:

- Among those who chose *geographic split* first, a majority chose *specific services* as their second choice (63%).

- Among those who chose *specific services* first, *geographic split* was the most common second choice (61%);
- Among those who chose *new customers* first, *specific services* was the most common second choice (55%).

- ***Business Results:***

- Among those who chose *geographic split* first, a significant majority chose *specific services* as their second choice (74%).
- Among those who chose *specific services* first, *geographic split* was the most common second choice (64%);
- Among those who chose *new customers* first, *specific services* was the most common second choice (61%).

Naturally, because we asked customers to name their first and second preferences, we can also determine which option is *least* preferred of the three. Among residence customers, most consider *new customers* to be their least preferred option — 54%. Much smaller proportions consider either *specific services* (26%) or *geographic split* (20%) to be the option they'd *least like* to see adopted.

Business customers are even more likely to consider *new customers* to be the least attractive option — 66% of business customers ranked this option last. By contrast, only 19% ranked *specific services* last, and only 15% ranked *geographic split* last.

The Fairest Option

Which area code option customers *personally prefer* is one issue; which option they think would be *fairest for everyone in the state* is, at least in theory, a somewhat different issue. For example, a given customer might feel that a particular option would not benefit him or her personally (e.g., *specific services* for a cellular

customer), but that same customer might also feel that such an option would be *fairest*, considering the interests, needs, and characteristics of customers (residence and business) across Connecticut.

It turns out in this case that the distribution of options on this *fairness* measure is virtually identical to the distribution on personal preferences:

	Residence Customers	Business Customers
	%	%
<i>Fairest for Everyone</i>		
Geographic split	54	60
Specific services	24	24
New customers	17	12
Not sure	6	4

The fact that the preference and fairness distributions are as close as they are does *not* necessarily mean that *all* customers chose the *same* option as both preferred and most fair. In fact, some customers did distinguish between options that are personally preferred and options that are perceived as fairest. However, the degree to which this was the case varied by option:

- Those who originally chose *geographic split* as most preferred had a strong tendency to also choose *geographic split* as fairest.
- While those who preferred one of the other options also had a tendency to stick with that option as fairest, they were somewhat less likely to do so. And where customers *did* make a different choice, they were most likely to feel that *geographic split* was fairer than the option they originally preferred.

For example, as the following table shows:

- 83% of residence customers who selected *geographic split* as their most preferred option continued to choose *geographic split* as the *fairest* option.
- On the other hand, among residence customers who selected *specific services* as their preferred option, a lower 68% of residence customers continued to choose

that option as fairest. And a total of 18% of these customers felt that *geographic split* was actually the fairest option.

- The results are almost identical among those who chose *new customers* as most preferred – 67% continue to think it would be fairest, but 18% feel that geographic split would be fairest.

<i>Residence Customers</i>	<i>Prefer Adopted Right Now</i>		
	<i>Geographic Split</i>	<i>Specific Services</i>	<i>New Customers</i>
<i>Fairest for Everyone:</i>	%	%	%
Geographic split	83	18	18
Specific services	6	68	12
New customers	7	8	67
Not sure	4	6	4

The results are similar for business customers – although business customers who personally *preferred* geographic split are even more likely than residence customers to stick with that option as *fairest*. What's more, business customers who initially chose *specific services* as their most preferred option are even more likely than residence customers to switch to geographic split as fairest.

<i>Business Customers</i>	<i>Prefer Adopted Right Now</i>		
	<i>Geographic Split</i>	<i>Specific Services</i>	<i>New Customers</i>
<i>Fairest for Everyone:</i>	%	%	%
Geographic split	94	24	14
Specific services	3	68	4
New customers	2	3	82
Not sure	1	4	-

Conclusion

The results from this chapter point strongly to the *geographic split* option as the option that customers both prefer and consider to be fairest for everyone in the state. The results also point strongly to the *distributed overlay* (a.k.a. *new customers*) option as the *least* preferred of the three. Interestingly, these results are consistent among customers regardless of wireless status; for example, even though geographic split would require cellular and paging customers to have their equipment reprogrammed, majorities of even these customers prefer geographic split – by significant margins – over specific services and new customers (the one option that would not require reprogramming).

In the next chapter, we'll examine the reasons underlying customers' choices – including top-of-mind reasons for preferring a given option, as well as reactions to potential benefits and drawbacks of each. We'll see evidence that geographic split is the option of choice because it is perceived by customers as logical and less confusing. We'll also see that each of the other services is saddled with a significant concern that keeps customers from choosing it.

Finally, in Chapter 3, we'll examine the impact of this "education" process – i.e., we'll examine the extent to which the discussion of potential benefits and drawbacks in the interview caused customers to change their minds about the options they prefer and consider fairest.

2

Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks of Each Option

Introduction

In this chapter, we'll examine the perceptions and attitudes underlying customers' reactions to each of the three area code options tested in the research. These perceptions and attitudes were gathered in two ways: first, by asking customers to explain why they chose a given option as *most preferred*, and second, by asking customers to react to a number of predetermined *benefits and drawbacks* of each option.

Top of Mind Reasons for Preferences

In Chapter 1, we saw that the majority of both residence and business customers choose *geographic split* as the area code option they prefer most. And when these customers are asked why they prefer this option, words like *clear*, *easy*, and *logical* predominate their responses.

Specifically, the top three reasons for choosing *geographic split* as most preferred were the following:

- *Easy, logical, or less confusing [than other options]*: Mentioned by 42% of residence customers and 41% of business customers;
- *Clear division of different regions*: Mentioned by 21% of residence customers and 29% of business customers;
- *Easier to make calls when you know the region to begin with*: Mentioned by 12% of residence customers and 27% of business customers.

Indeed, the strength of the geographic split option seems to rest in the fact that it appears clearer and more simple to customers — since one would more easily know when to dial the new area code and when not to.

Customers also offered some additional reasons for preferring this option, including the following:

- Some customers explained that *this approach works well in other states* (mentioned by 13% of residence and 11% of business customers);
- Others liked the fact that *everyone in the same area would have the same area code* (mentioned by 10% of residence and 10% of business customers);
- Others felt that this would be the *best long term option* for the state (mentioned by 10% of residence and 11% of business customers).

This question was also asked of customers who chose the *specific services* option as most preferred. In general, although the most commonly mentioned response was that the option would be easy, simple, and less confusing, the proportions mentioning this are significantly lower than was true for geographic split.

As we suggested in the previous chapter, the findings reveal that a number of customers who chose this option liked the idea that it would signal to a caller when he or

she was calling a cellular phone or a pager. However, a number of other customers were more likely to have self-interest in mind when they chose this option. Some explicitly stated that they preferred *specific services* because "my" area code would not change; moreover, some business customers explained that they chose the option because in their opinion, businesses should not have their area code changed.

Overall, the most popular responses for *specific services* were the following:

- *Easy, logical, and less confusing*: Mentioned by 29% of residence customers and 30% of business customers;
- *People with specific services should have a new area code*: Mentioned by 20% of residence customers and 26% of business customers;
- *My area code won't change with this*: Mentioned by 20% of residence customers and 18% of business customers;
- *Businesses should not get a new area code*: Mentioned by 4% of residence customers, but 22% of business customers.

The relatively small proportion of customers who preferred *new customers* essentially restated the way the option would work in explaining the reasons for their choice -- stating that they don't think existing customers should have their area code changed, or that it's more appropriate to give brand new customers the new area code. In addition, as was the case with *specific services*, a number of business customers chose this option because they don't think businesses should have to get a new area code.

Finally, although a sizable proportion of customers chose this option because they think it will be *easy, logical, and less confusing*, the proportion, again, is significantly lower than it was for geographic split.

Overall, the most popular reasons for choosing *new customers* were the following:

- *Old customers should not be disrupted:* Mentioned by 38% of residence customers and 48% of business customers;
- *New customers should get the new area code:* Mentioned by 27% of residence customers and 17% of business customers;
- *Easy, logical, less confusing:* Mentioned by 26% of residence customers and 22% of business customers;
- *Businesses should not get a new area code:* Mentioned by 3% of residence customers, but 19% of business customers.

All in all, when we consider the fact that (1) customers are most likely to prefer the *geographic split* option generally, and (2) customers are most likely to choose this option because they consider it *easy, logical, and less confusing*, we can conclude the following: When it comes to new area codes, what's most important to customers is an area code approach that is clear and easy to understand.

Reactions to Benefits and Drawbacks

All customers, regardless of their preference, were asked to react to a list of potential benefits for each option, as well as a list of potential drawbacks. In particular, customers were asked whether they consider each potential benefit to be a *major benefit, a minor benefit, or not a benefit*. For the drawbacks, customers were asked whether they consider each to be a *major drawback, a minor drawback, or not a drawback*.

Geographic Split: The benefits and drawbacks tested for *geographic split* were the following:

Benefits:

- There would be a clear dividing line in the state between one area code and the next;
- Everyone in the region would have the same area code.

Drawbacks:

- About one-half of customers in the state would get a new area code;
- A large number of customers would need to update their stationery;
- A large number of businesses would need to update their advertising and business cards;
- Customers with cellular telephones or pagers would need to bring their phones and pagers to a specified location, in order to have them reprogrammed with the new area code;
- Business equipment such as fax machines, modems, alarm systems, and automatic dialers would need to be reprogrammed.

In general, customers are more likely to see the tested *benefits* of the *geographic split* option as *major* benefits than they are to see the tested *drawbacks* as *major* drawbacks. In other words, the proportions rating the benefit statements as *major benefits* are higher than the proportions rating the drawbacks statements as *major drawbacks*.

The results are indicated in the following table:

	Residence Customers			Business Customers		
	Total	Cellular Total	Pager Total	Total	Small Business	Large Business
Geographic Split:	%	%	%	%	%	%
% Major Benefit:						
All in region would have same area code	69	71	66	71	70	79
Clear dividing line in the state	54	58	58	62	62	74
% Major Drawback:						
Businesses would need to update ads and business cards	44	45	46	51	51	50
Cellular phones and pagers would need to be reprogrammed	37	37	37	29	29	32
Customers would need to update stationery	36	35	33	45	45	42
Business equipment would need to be reprogrammed	34	30	32	30	30	30
Half would get new area code	21	18	22	22	22	19

The table also demonstrates that reactions to these benefits and drawbacks do not vary considerably by type of customer — residence vs. business, wireless vs. non-wireless, large vs. small business. The only major differences that do exist are the following:

- Business customers in general are, not surprisingly, more concerned than residence customers about having to update stationery;
- Large business customers in particular are more likely to see both of the tested benefits of this option — everyone in the same region would have the same area code, and the fact that there'd be a clear dividing line between regions — as major benefits.

We should point out that significant minorities of cellular and paging customers consider the need to reprogram their equipment a *major drawback* of this option. However, even these customers are *much more likely* to consider each of the benefits tested to be *major benefits*. In other words, cellular and paging customers apparently feel

that the benefits of this option significantly outweigh the drawback of having to have their equipment reprogrammed.

All in all, then, the results corroborate the findings uncovered when examining customers' top-of-mind reactions — namely, customers like the *ease and clarity* that would result from the fact that *everyone in the region would have the same area code*, and that there would be a *clear dividing line between regions*.

Specific Services: The benefits and drawbacks tested for *specific services* were the following:

Benefits:

- All standard telephone service would use the existing area code;
- Fewer customers would have to switch area codes;
- Fewer customers would have to update their stationery, business cards, etc.

Drawbacks:

- Customers with certain services, such as cellular phones or pagers, would need to bring their phones or pagers to a specific location, in order to have them reprogrammed with the new area code;
- For technological reasons, this method would only temporarily resolve the number shortage problem. Within a few years, one of the other options would have to be adopted;
- Because some local calls would be to a different area code, many local calls would require dialing 10 digits;
- Business equipment making outgoing calls — such as fax machines, modems, alarm systems, and automatic dialers — would need to be reprogrammed to take 10-digit local calling into account;

- There would be no geographic boundary between area codes.

The findings indicate that according to customers, *specific services* would bring with it a significant drawback — the fact that this would be a *temporary solution* to the number shortage problem. In fact, customers are more likely to rate this as a *major drawback* of specific services than to rate any of the benefits as *major benefits*.

What's more, the fact that the option would only temporarily resolve the number shortage problem — and that another area code solution need to be adopted down the road — is a particular concern among large business customers.

	Residence Customers			Business Customers		
	Total	Cellular Total	Pager Total	Total	Small Business	Large Business
Specific Services:	%	%	%	%	%	%
% Major Benefit:						
Standard service would allow 203 area code	52	55	58	55	55	60
Fewer customers would have to switch	50	54	54	54	55	51
Fewer customers would have to update stationery, etc.	42	46	43	54	54	56
% Major Drawback:						
Method would only temporarily resolve problem	56	58	45	60	60	66
Cellular and pager would need to be reprogrammed	40	43	39	31	31	38
Some local calls would require 10 digits	42	37	37	37	37	34
Business equipment would need to be reprogrammed for changing calls	37	30	34	32	32	32
There'd be no geographic boundary between area codes	32	30	35	31	31	34

The table once again shows that business customers are more concerned than residence customers about the need to update stationery. But other than that (and the fact, mentioned above, that large business customers are especially concerned about the